

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 17, 2009 has been received and its contents have been carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 6-7 and 10. No new matters have been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1 -13 are currently pending for reconsideration. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1, 2, and 6, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that *Um et al.*, *Ito et al.*, and *St. Pierre*., whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the newly cited features of “first determination means, configured to determine whether or not an extension of a still image file instructed to be reproduced is a predetermined extension; second determination means, configured to analyze a header of the still image file and determine whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is compressed in a decodable

format to the body when the first determination means determines that the extension of the still image file is the predetermined extension;” and “wherein the second determination means is configured to determine that the still image file is the still image file that is compressed in the decodable format to the body, when a marker indicating that the still image file is a file of a progressive JPEG format is present in a range from a marker indicating an image start to a marker indicating a scan start with of the inputted header, and in a case that a code indicating the JPEG format is present.”

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 10, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that *Um et al.*, *Ito et al.*, and *St. Pierre.*, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the newly cited features of “a first control unit, configured to determine whether or not an extension of a still image file instructed to be reproduced is a predetermined extension; and a second control means, configured to analyze a header of the still image file and determine whether or not the still image file is a still image file that is compressed in a decodable format when the first control unit determines that the extension of the still image file is the predetermined extension,” and “wherein the second control unit is configured to determine that the still image file is the still image file that is compressed in the decodable format to the body, when a marker indicating that the still image file is a file of a progressive JPEG format is present in a range from a marker indicating an image start to a marker indicating a scan start with of the inputted header, and in a case that a code indicating the JPEG format is present.” Therefore, applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither *Um et al.*, *Ito et al.* nor *St. Pierre.*, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 10, as amended. Furthermore,

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3-5, 7-9, and 11-13 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 2, 6, and 10 and the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

By: _____

Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: May 18, 2009

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel: 202.739.3000

Fax: 202.739.3001